



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/544,117

08/01/2005

Gopi Shankar

020093-003610US

6410

20350

7590

07/09/2008

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

JUEDES, AMY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/09/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Art Unit: 1644

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment, filed 4/14/08, is acknowledged.

Claims 13 and 15-16 have been amended.

Claims 1-49 are pending.

2. Applicant's election with traverse of group I, drawn to an isolated population of antigen presenting cells, in the reply filed 4/14/08 is acknowledged. However, upon reconsideration, the restriction requirement mailed 10/18/07 is withdrawn. The following is a new requirement for restriction.

3. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

4. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

5. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Claims 1-5 link(s) inventions I-IV. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), 1-5. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 **Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1644

Group I, claims 6-10 and 26, drawn to an isolated population of antigen presenting cells and said population further comprising a predetermined antigen.

Group II, claims 11-15, drawn to an isolated population of antigen presenting cells and said population further comprising a cytokine.

Group III, claims 16-25, drawn to an isolated population of antigen presenting cells and said population further comprising a T cell or NK cell.

Group IV, claim 27, drawn to an isolated population of antigen presenting cells and said population further comprising a predetermined antigen and a T cell/NK cell.

Group V, claims 28-39, drawn to a method for isolating a population of dendritic cells.

Group VI, claims 40-49, drawn to a method for modulating a T cell response to an antigen.

6. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Applicant is further required to elect:

a specific type of enriched dendritic cell from the group consisting of mature or immature dendritic cells (if groups I-IV are elected),

a specific type of antigen such as one of those listed in claims 7-10 (if group I is elected),

a specific cytokine, such as one of those listed in claim 13 or 15 (if group II is elected),

a specific type of cell from the group consisting of a T cell or an NK cell (if group III or IV is elected). If a T cell is elected, Applicant is further required to elect a specific type of T cell, or a specific combination of T cells, such as one of those listed in claims 20-21 (if group III is elected),

Art Unit: 1644

a specific type of T cell from the group consisting of CD4 T cells, CD8 T cells, or a mixed population of CD4 and CD8 T cells (if group VI is elected),

and list all Claims readable thereon including those subsequently added. Currently claims 1-3 are generic with respect to an antigen presenting cell/dendritic cell, claim 6 is generic with respect to an antigen, claims 11-12 and 14 are generic with respect to a cytokine, and claims 16-19 and 40-46 are generic with respect to a T cell.

7. The inventions listed as Groups I-VI and the species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reason:

The invention of Group I, the isolated population of antigen presenting cells, has no special technical feature that defined the contribution over the prior art of Liu et al., 2001 (of record), as evidenced by Randolph et al., 2008.

Liu et al. teach a population of monocyte pre-DC1s that express CD11c and CD14 (see page 259 in particular). As evidenced by Randolph et al., CD11c is marker for antigen-presenting cells, and CD11c expressing monocytes present antigen to T cells (see page 54 in particular). Therefore, the CD11c expressing monocytes of Liu et al. are antigen presenting cells.

8. Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

9. Accordingly, Groups I-VI are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept and restriction is proper.

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1644

11. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amy E. Juedes, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4471. The examiner can normally be reached on 6am - 2pm, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen O'Hara can be reached on 571-272-0878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amy Juedes  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
/Amy E. Juedes/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1644